

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS.

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are independent. Claim 2 has been previously cancelled without any prejudice and disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 19-23.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,561,466 to Kiriyama (hereinafter, merely “Kiriyama”) in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art, (hereinafter, merely “AAPA”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A data multiplexer...comprising:

a first calculating means for calculating a time division multiplexing cycle for each of said plurality of bit streams, such that a separator separates multiplexed data by a specified method on the basis of said information extracted by said extracting means,

wherein the first calculating means calculates the time division multiplexing cycle irrespective of the transport rate of said plurality of bit streams,

...wherein said multiplexing means determines an order in which said plurality of bit streams are multiplexed on the basis of the data occupancy rate of said virtual data buffer calculated by said second calculating means.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Kiriyama relates to data multiplexing an original video signal and an original audio signal into a cell multiplexed video and audio signal, such as a sequence of asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) cells, and to data demultiplexing the cell multiplexed video and audio signal into the original video signal and the original audio signal.

First, the Office Action (see page 3) relies on Kiriyama, especially column 5, lines 1-45, to disclose a first calculating means for calculating a time division multiplexing cycle for each of said plurality of bit streams, such that a separator separates multiplexed data by a specified method on the basis of said information extracted by said extracting means, as recited in claim 1. Kiriyama uses a predetermined period T that has a time slots TA for audio data and a time slots TV for video data. However, Nothing in Kiriyama discloses or teaches how to determine T, TA, and TV for each stream. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kiriyama fails to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1.

Second, the Office Action (see page 6) relies on AAPA to disclose wherein said multiplexing means determines an order in which said plurality of bit streams are multiplexed on the basis of the data occupancy rate of said virtual data buffer calculated by said second calculating means, as recited in claim 1. As understood by Applicants, AAPA indeed states occupancy rate. However, AAPA fails to disclose or teach determines an order in which said plurality of bit streams are multiplexed on the basis of the data occupancy rate of said virtual data buffer calculated by said second calculating means. Applicants respectfully submit that AAPA does not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kiriyama and AAPA, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest wherein the first calculating means calculates the time division multiplexing cycle irrespective to the transport rate of said plurality of bit streams, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 3 and 4 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800